

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 8-22 stand in this application. Claims 1-7 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claim 8 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 8 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits.

Specification

The specification stands objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 has been canceled. Furthermore, according to the Office Action, the specification fails to support the limitation “said table consisting of multiple entries, each entry identifying an on-chip configuration plane and identifying a unique off-chip address of a loaded configuration” which is also recited in claim 8. Applicant respectfully submits that support for this limitation can be found in the specification at least at figure 5 and page 7, lines 16-22.

The given cite, in relevant part, states:

a separate table is maintained that stores the address of the configuration that is currently loaded in each decompressed plane. While the chip is executing, this table can be used to verify that the intended configurations have actually be pre-fetched and are still resident in the planes. This table can

also be used to save and restore the state of the chip in the event of an interrupt. This table can also be used to boot some initial configurations into the chip during the power-up.

Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that proper support for the above recited language of claim 8 can be found in the specification and withdraw of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for allegedly being based on a disclosure that is not enabling. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the § 112 rejection.

Allowable Claims

We would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 9, 15 and 21 if amended to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that these claims represent patentable subject matter as currently listed based on the amendments and/or remarks given for the independent claims as discussed in detail below. Applicant would like to respectfully reserve the right, however, to amend the allowable claims into independent form during further prosecution if warranted.

35 U.S.C. § 102

At page 4, paragraph 7 of the Office Action claims 8, 10-14 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by United States Patent Number (USPN) 6,571,381 to Vorbach (“Vorbach”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See MPEP § 2131*, for example. Applicant submits that Vorbach fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 8, 10-14 and 16-20 and thus they define over Vorbach. For example, with respect to claim 8, Vorbach fails to teach, among other things, the following language:

said table comprising of multiple entries, each entry identifying an on-chip configuration plane and identifying a unique off-chip address of a loaded configuration.

According to the Office Action, this language is disclosed by Vorbach at column 5, lines 61-64, column 9, lines 23-24 and column 11, lines 43-46. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 defines over Vorbach. Vorbach at the given cites, in relevant part, states:

An external configuration memory (ECR), containing all KR's is assigned here to the root CT, while the configurable elements (CELS) which call up the individual KR's are assigned to the leaves....

At another fixed address range (LUT ECR) of any desired length which is, however, predefined within an application there are jumps to the individual KR's. The <ID> of each KR is used as an address in ECR where the start address of the respective KR is located; thus KR's are addressed indirectly....

By way of contrast, the claimed subject matter teaches “said table comprising of multiple entries, each entry identifying an on-chip configuration plane and identifying a unique off-chip address of a loaded configuration.” Applicant respectfully submits that this is different than the above recited teaching of Vorbach.

Applicant respectfully submits that using an ID as an address to identify the start of a KR, as arguably taught by Vorbach in the above recited language, is clearly different than multiple entries in a table with each entry identifying an on-chip configuration plane and identifying a unique off-chip address of a loaded configuration as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate the above recited language of claim 8 in the teaching of Vorbach. Consequently, Vorbach fails to disclose all the elements or features of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 8. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 9-10, which depend from claim 8 and, therefore, contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Vorbach.

Claims 11 and 18 recite features similar to those recited in claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 and 18 are not anticipated and are patentable over Vorbach for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 11 and 18. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 12-17 and 19-21 that depend from claims

11 and 18 respectively, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Vorbach.

35 U.S.C. § 103

At page 6, paragraph 18 of the Office Action claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vorbach. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See MPEP § 2143.03*, for example. As recited above, Applicant respectfully submits that Vorbach fails to teach each and every element recited in independent claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 contains additional features that further distinguish this claim from Vorbach. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is non-obvious and patentable over Vorbach at least on the basis of its dependency from claim 18. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to this dependent claim.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 22 is non-obvious and represents patentable subject matter in view of the cited reference. Accordingly, removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 22 is respectfully requested. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited reference

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims [number] are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9338 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to deposit account 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: February 11, 2008

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O Intelleivate
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(724) 933-5529